

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-4, 8-10, 13-35, and 37-39 are pending in the application, with claims 1-4, 13, 14, 26, 27, 38 and 39 being the independent claims. Claims 1-4 are sought to be amended. Claims 5-7, 11, 12, and 36 are sought to be cancelled by the current amendment without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 13-35 and 37-39 are currently withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-4 have been amended to clarify Applicants' invention by substituting the phrase "level of interference" for the phrase "level of formation," and adding the phrase "by detecting GTP-binding form of activated-Rac." Support for these changes can be found throughout the specification as filed, for example, in Example 3, at pages 27-28, and in original claim 7.

These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

### **I. Claim Objections**

Claim 6 is objected to on the ground that there appears to be a typographical error in line 3 related to the word "acted." (Office Action, at page 2, paragraph 4.)

Claim 6 has been cancelled, rendering the objection moot. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection be withdrawn.

### **II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. (Office Action, at page 2, paragraph 6.)

With respect to claims 1-4, 6 and 7, the Examiner believes that the language of the measuring/estimating step does not reflect with sufficient clarity the interference recited in the preamble. In this regard, the Examiner suggests introducing the phrase "level of interference" in place of "level of formation" in these claims. (Office Action, at page 3, lines 3-6.) Claims

5 and 8-10 are rejected as depending from rejected claims. (Office Action, at page 3, lines 6-7.)

To expedite prosecution and without acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants have amended claims 1-4 and 7 to implement the Examiner's suggestion. The related change likewise affects dependent claims 8-10.

Claims 5-7 have been cancelled, mooting this aspect of the rejection.

Claims 6, 11, 12, and 36 also are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. (Office Action, at pages 3 and 4, paragraphs 7-10.) To expedite prosecution and without acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants have cancelled claims 6, 11, 12, and 36.

Applicants believe that the rejection of claims 1-12 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome, and they respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

### **III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph (Enablement)**

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. (Office Action, at page 4, paragraph 12.)

Specifically, with respect to claims 1-4 and 6, the Examiner believes that although these claims recite an "estimating" step, they do no specifically recite how this estimation step is to be carried out. (Office Action, at page 5, lines 7-10.) According to the Examiner, dependent claims 5 and 8-12 also do not further limit the estimating step or provide any additional limitation for the breadth of the estimating step. (Office Action, at page 5, lines 22-25.)

To expedite prosecution and without acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants have incorporated the subject matter of claim 7 into claims 1-4 and cancelled claim 7, whereby claims 1-4 now prescribe an estimating by detecting GTP-binding form of activated-Rac." Because claims 8-10 depend from amended claim 1, they incorporate all the elements of amended claim 1. In addition, Applicants have cancelled claims 5, 6, 11, and 12.

Claim 36 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. (Office Action, at page 6, paragraph 14.)

To expedite prosecution, and without acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants have cancelled claim 36, rendering the rejection moot.

Applicants believe that the rejection of claims 1-12 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, has been overcome and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

**IV. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph (Written Description)**

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. (Office Action, at page 7, paragraph 15.)

As discussed above, claim 36 has been cancelled, rendering the rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

**V. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Hewitt et al., U.S. Pat. No. 4,996,193. (Office Action, at page 9, paragraph 17.)

As discussed above, claim 36 has been cancelled, rendering the rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid

amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 12, 2008

By Ann E. Summerfield

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5490  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Ann E. Summerfield  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 47,982